

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

-vs-

DAVID EMILE COLBERT,

Defendant.

No. 2:13-CR-0008-WFN-15

ORDER

Before the Court is the Government's Motion for Reconsideration of Court Order - ECF No. 3097, ECF No. 3120. Defendant responded, ECF No. 3194. The Court previously granted Defendant's request that the Government disclose to him all statements of cooperating Defendants, including, but not limited to free talk reports, which the Government previously provided to the Court to review in camera. ECF No. 3097 (amending ECF No. 3096). In the pending Motion, the Government asks the Court to reconsider that ruling.

In support of its Motion, the Government relies largely on *United States v. Ruiz*, 536 U.S. 622 (2002), which held "the Constitution does not require the Government to disclose material impeachment evidence prior to entering a plea agreement with a criminal defendant," *id* at 633. The Court questions whether the holding of *Ruiz* is directly applicable to this case. *Ruiz* addressed pre-guilty plea disclosures whereas, in this case, Defendant's request is made post-guilty plea for purposes of preparing for sentencing. Nevertheless, the Court acknowledges that the Supreme Court's reasoning in *Ruiz* might offer some guidance to resolving the issue presented by the parties. *See id.* (noting that disclosure of impeachment evidence is "more closely related to the *fairness* of a trial than to the *voluntariness* of the plea").

1 The Court need not resolve the issue solely on *Ruiz*, however, because the Court  
2 concludes that any information contained in the materials requested by defense counsel is  
3 not material to sentencing. Other than *Brady* material, there is no constitutional right to  
4 discovery. *Brady* requires disclosure of evidence that is both favorable to the accused and  
5 material to either guilt or to punishment. The Court may not sentence a defendant based  
6 on confidential information not disclosed to the defense. *See, e.g., United States v.*  
7 *Weintraub*, 871 F.2d 1257, 1265 (5th Cir. 1989) (vacating the defendant's sentence and  
8 remanding the case for a new sentencing hearing based on material withheld impeachment  
9 evidence).

10 The Court has reviewed the draft presentence report [PSR], ECF No. 2986. The  
11 Court concludes that the draft PSR does not hold Defendant accountable for drug  
12 quantities or the conduct of coconspirators based on evidence not disclosed to defense  
13 counsel. Rather, Defendant's conduct described in the draft PSR is derived from  
14 surveillance, intercepted communications, and evidence found upon the execution of  
15 search warrants. Defendant received all this material in discovery.

16 As noted above, specificity is important in sentencing. But the Government does  
17 not intend to call witnesses at sentencing, ECF No. 3120 at 10, and the Court is unaware of  
18 any other information concerning Defendant that will affect its sentencing decision.  
19 Unless Defendant can point to information contained in the PSR that is based on non-  
20 disclosed discovery, the free talk reports and statements of co-Defendants will not affect  
21 sentencing and are not material to Defendant's punishment.

22 The Court has reviewed the file and the parties' briefing and is fully informed.  
23 Accordingly,

24 **IT IS ORDERED** that:

25 1. The Government's Motion for Reconsideration of Court Order - ECF No. 3097,  
26 filed November 26, 2014, **ECF No. 3120**, is **GRANTED**.

27 2. The Court's Order filed November 25, 2014, ECF No. 3097 (amending ECF  
28 No. 3095), is **WITHDRAWN**.

